

REMARKS

Claims 29-41 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-32 of U.S. Patent No. 6,863,446 B2. Attached is a terminal disclaimer and a check for the terminal disclaimer fee. The examiner is requested to reconsider this rejection.

Claims 29, 31-33, 35 and 38-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beard et al. (US 5,317,663) in view of Estrella et al. (US 6,695,485 B1). Claims 36, 37 and 41 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beard et al. (US 5,317,663) in view of Estrella et al. (US 6,695,485 B1) and Ernst et al. (US 5,825,955). Claims 34 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Beard et al. (US 5,317,663) in view of Estrella et al. (US 6,695,485 B1) and Szilagyi et al. (US 6,305,961 B1). The examiner is requested to reconsider these rejections.

Claim 29 has been amended above to clarify applicant's claimed invention. In particular, claim 29 claims that the latch inserts are separately connected to the housing. In Beard et al. the inner housing halves 410, 420 are captured in grooves 238, 239 by their flanges 450. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Beard et al. of the first inner housing half 410 and the second inner housing half 420 being separately connected to the main body 205. Claim 29 on the other hand claims that the latch inserts are separately connected to the

housing. The other art of record does nothing to cure the deficiencies of Beard et al. Therefore, claim 29 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though dependent claims 30-38 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 29. However, to expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Claim 39 has been amended above to clarify applicants' claimed invention. In particular, claim 39 claims that the pair of inner adapter housings are separately spring latch connected to the outer adapter housing proximate opposite ends of the passage. As noted above, in Beard et al. the inner housing halves 410, 420 are captured in grooves 238, 239 by their flanges 450. There is no disclosure or suggestion in Beard et al. of the two inner housing halves 410, 420 being separately spring latch connected to the outer adapter housing proximate opposite ends of the passage of the main body 205. Claim 39 on the other hand claims that the pair of inner adapter housings are separately spring latch connected to the outer adapter housing proximate opposite ends of the passage. The other art of record does nothing to cure the deficiencies of Beard et al. Therefore, claim 39 is patentable and should be allowed.

Though dependent claims 40-41 contain their own allowable subject matter, these claims should at least be allowable due to their dependence from allowable claim 39. However, to

Appl. No.: 10/087,433
Reply to Office Action of: 04/15/2005

expedite prosecution at this time, no further comment will be made.

Claims 44-45 have been added above to claim the features recited therein.

For all of the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now present in the application are clearly novel and patentable over the prior art of record. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested. Should any unresolved issue remain, the Examiner is invited to call applicant's Attorney at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Mark F. Harrington 7/8/05
Mark F. Harrington (Reg. No. 31,686) Date

Customer No.: 29683
Harrington & Smith, LLP
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
203-925-9400

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail on the date shown below in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner For Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

7/8/05 Ann O'Brien
Date Name of Person Making Deposit